

Remarks

I. Status

Claims 1-12 have been examined. Claims 11-12 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-10 are pending.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the claimed ceramic roller is used in a fixing device. Support for this recitation can be found in the specification at, *inter alia*, page 9, lines 11-12. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite the inclusion of 100 parts by weight of one or more heat-resistant glass frits. Support for this recitation can be found, *inter alia*, in the specification at page 16, line 12. Claims 1 and 5 have also been amended to clarify the antecedent basis for the recited terms. Support for such amendment to claim 1 can be found, *inter alia*, in the specification at page 19, lines 2-4. Support for such amendment to claim 5 can be found, *inter alia*, in the specification at page 36, lines 2-12 and in Figure 4. No new matter has been added by any of the requested amendments.

II. The Rejection of claims 1-11 Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-11 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph in light of a concern that the term “inorganic binder” would have been perceived as indefinite by those of ordinary skill. Although Applicants believe that the term “inorganic binder” is fully definite, Applicants have amended the claims to delete this term. It is believed that the amended claims now clearly recite that the weight percent relates to the ceramic, and that the ceramic is composed of one or more glass frits and up to about 83.3% by weight of a heat-resistant inorganic material [i.e., up to 500/(500+100) parts of the heat-resistant inorganic material]. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection may be properly withdrawn.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 1 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph in light of a concern that the antecedent basis for the recited density would have been perceived as indefinite by those of ordinary skill. Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify the antecedent basis of the recitation, and submit that such action fully

responds to the Examiner's concerns. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection may be properly withdrawn.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 5 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph in light of a concern that the antecedent basis for the term "the shafts" would have been perceived as indefinite by those of ordinary skill. Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration. Claim 1 recites that the ceramic roller comprises "a shaft," and thus encompasses devices which comprise multiple shafts (please see, for example, the specification at page 36, lines 2-12 and in Figure 4). Applicants have, however, amended claim 5 to provide additional antecedent basis for its recitations and submit that such action fully responds to the Examiner's concerns. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection may be properly withdrawn.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 11 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph in light of a concern that the antecedent basis for the term "having grooves... convexities" would have been perceived as indefinite by those of ordinary skill. Claim 11 has been cancelled. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is moot.

In light of the above remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1-11 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph may be properly withdrawn.

III. The Rejection of Claims 11-12 Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 11-12 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in light of Takei *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,893,210). Although Applicants submit that the inventions of claims 11-12 are patentable over Takei *et al.*, in the interests of advancing the prosecution of the Application, Applicants have cancelled claims 11-12. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is moot.

IV. The Rejection of Claims 1-3, 9 and 10 Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 9 and 10 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in light of Asaumi *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,533,581) when considered with Shorr (U.S. Patent No. 3,877,919). Specifically, the Examiner has advised that Asaumi *et al.*

teaches elements of Applicants' invention with the exception of a surface coating. Shorr is stated to teach such a coating. Applicants respectfully traverse, and request consideration in light of the amended claims.

Applicants note the Examiner's statement that Asuami *et al.* teach the use of an inorganic binder of colloidal silica. Applicants have amended the present claims to recite the use of one or more glass frits, and respectfully submit that such use is neither taught nor suggested by Asuami *et al.* Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection may properly be withdrawn.

V. The Rejection of Claims 4-5 Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 9 and 10 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in light of Asaumi *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,533,581) when considered with Shorr (U.S. Patent No. 3,877,919) and Takei. Specifically, the Examiner has advised that Asaumi *et al.* teaches elements of Applicants' invention with the exception of a surface coating. Shorr is stated to teach such a coating. Takei is cited as teaching embedded fibers. Applicants respectfully traverse, and request consideration in light of the amended claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to teach or suggest the use of one or more glass frits as presently claimed by Applicants. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection may properly be withdrawn.

VI. The Rejection of Claims 6-8 Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 9 and 10 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in light of Asaumi *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,533,581) when considered with Shorr (U.S. Patent No. 3,877,919) and Tsukida *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,450,181). Specifically, the Examiner has advised that Asaumi *et al.* teaches elements of Applicants' invention with the exception of a surface coating. Shorr is stated to teach such a coating. Tsudika *et al.* is cited as teaching the use of a fluoro-resin coating. Applicants respectfully traverse, and request consideration in light of the amended claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to teach or suggest the use of one or more glass frits as presently claimed by Applicants. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection may properly be withdrawn.

VII. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for Allowance, and earnestly solicit early notice of such favorable action. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned with respect to any issues regarding this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: November 3, 2006
Edell, Shapiro & Finnan, LLC
1901 Research Blvd., Suite 400
Rockville, MD 20850
Tel: (301) 424-3640 / Fax (301) 762-4056

/Jeffrey I. Auerbach/
Jeffrey I. Auerbach
Reg. No. 32,680
Attorney for Applicants